

NYNEX Government Affairs
1300 I Street NW Suite 400 West Washington DC 20005
202-336-7891

Kenneth Rust
Director
Federal Regulatory Matters

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

NYNEX

February 6, 1997

Ex Parte

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

RECEIVED
FEB 6 1997
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION


Re: CC Docket No. 96-45

Dear Mr. Caton:

Yesterday, Susanne Guyer, Frank Gumper, and I, representing NYNEX, met with Jim Coltharp, Special Counsel to Commissioner Quello, regarding the item captioned above. The attached material served as the points of discussion, during which NYNEX repeated its views expressed previously in filings in the item.

Any questions on this matter should be directed to me at either the address or the telephone number shown above.

Sincerely,



Attachment

cc: J. Coltharp (letter only)

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

0+1



NYNEX Recycles

Joint Board Recommendations

■ Proxy Model

- The ultimate model adopted by the FCC should include geographically defined areas that are consistent with the geographic areas used for unbundled elements, access, and retail rates.
- Inconsistent geographic areas will result in arbitrage.

Necessary Linkage between Universal Service and Network Elements

Universal Service = Network Elements plus Retail Costs

a) Network Elements = Loop
 Port
 Local Switching (500-700 MOUs)
 Transport and Terminating Access
 Access to E911, Operator Services
 and Directory Assistance

b) Retail Costs = State Approved \$ per line to
 Cover Customer Care Costs for
 Basic Service

NYNEX

Example of inconsistent deaveraging of Universal Service support and unbundled elements.

UNBUNDLED ELEMENTS		
Zones	Areas	Average BCM2 Cost/Month*
1	Rural	\$38.42
2	Rural/Suburban	\$25.38
3	Suburban	\$22.04
4	Urban	\$20.12

**Assume retail costs of \$4.00/month*

UNIVERSAL SERVICE COSTS		
<i>Range of costs for individuals wire centers within Zone 1:</i>		
Wire Centers	Cost/ Month	Line Served
MILTON	\$23.98	12,415
ROME	\$26.78	27,951
GREENFIELD CENTER	\$48.91	4,914
BRAINARDSVILLE	\$124.70	1,010
ST. REGIS FALLS	\$122.92	1,251
PUTNAM	\$149.54	482

Gaming Opportunity: target high cost wire centers within a zone.

NYNEX.

There is Important Linkage Between Unbundled Network Elements and USF Support:

- Geographical deaveraging should be the same.
- For Universal Service Costing, Joint Board should specify reasonable number of zones in state (2-4)
 - Urban
 - Suburban
 - Rural
- Wire Center, Census Block Group -- administrative nightmare

NYNEX.

Joint Board Recommendations

CCL Proposal

- NYNEX agrees with proposal to take CCL and apply on a flat-rated, presubscribed line basis to IXC's if:
 - End user no-PIC's an IXC, end user pays per line charge.
 - IXC's can pass on to end user as a flat rated charge, if desired.

NYNEX.

Access Reform

- Flat rated, per line IXC charge should be extended to all non-traffic sensitive costs:
 - Loop
 - Line and trunk port of switch
 - Intrastate costs allocated to Interstate Access via separations
 - “Legacy” costs

Joint Board Recommendations

Concerns:

■ Cost Recovery

- Not addressed in the Joint Board's recommendation
- Customer "surcharge" most reasonable mechanism

■ Method of calculating carrier payments

- NYNEX proposal use of retail revenues less basic residence local service revenues
- Joint Board proposal results in disproportionate burden on LECs

NYNEX.

Funding the USF

Method	Industry (%)			NYNEX
	LEC	IXC	Other	
Retail Revenue Less Residence Local	38	50	12	4.9
Retail Revenues	47	43	10	6.1
Gross Revenue Less Carrier Payments	63	25	12	7.8

If Total Fund = \$8 Billion
NYNEX Share \$400 - \$600 Million

NYNEX.

difference in total RBOC funding levels.²⁵ However, this does not explain the dramatic differences in universal service support levels for a given RBOC between the two models, which both purport to identify costs by CBG. As can be seen in Chart 2, four of the RBOCs receive far less support under the Hatfield Model, while three receive considerably more. These inconsistencies cast doubt on the ability of proxy models to reliably target high-cost areas.

Chart 2²⁶
Comparison of RBOC Funding Levels Between BCM2 and Hatfield Models
Using \$30 Benchmark
All Dollars in Thousands (000)

RBOC	BCM2 Model	Hatfield Model	Funding Difference
Ameritech	\$ 377,904	\$ 272,290	\$ (105,614)
Bell Atlantic	\$ 417,184	\$ 109,157	\$ (308,027)
BellSouth	\$ 887,185	\$ 431,057	\$ (456,128)
NYNEX	\$ 460,032	\$ 96,150	\$ (363,882)
Pacific	\$ 193,118	\$ 249,906	\$ 56,788
SBC	\$ 440,108	\$ 682,682	\$ 242,574
US West	\$ 541,725	\$ 811,084	\$ 269,359
Total	\$ 3,317,256	\$ 2,652,326	

Additionally, individual state funding levels vary dramatically between the BCM2 Model and the Hatfield Model. Chart 3 illustrates how individual

²⁵ These differences include; (1) different line counts; (2) different input assumptions; and (3) different zone applications. Hatfield applies CBGs to one of six zones for the development of an average zone cost.

²⁶ Source: Hatfield Costs obtained from Telecommunications Industries Analysis Project (TIAP) - Response to Request from NARUC Committee, December 4, 1996, revised December 13, 1996, Figure 3, page 15; BCM2 costs obtained from NYNEX analysis of BCM2 Model - USF Funding Levels based on average monthly cost at CBG level and \$30 Benchmark.

Comparison of RBOC Funding Levels from BCM2 and Hatfield
\$30 Benchmark
Dollars in Thousands (000)

ATTACHMENT C

	BCM2	Hatfield	Difference
Ameritech	\$ 377,624	\$ 272,290	\$ (105,334)
Illinois	\$68,847	\$ 92,973	\$ 24,126
Indiana	\$58,008	\$ 34,605	\$ (23,403)
Michigan	\$139,411	\$ 56,298	\$ (83,113)
Ohio	\$74,177	\$ 33,883	\$ (40,314)
Wisconsin	\$37,181	\$ 54,551	\$ 17,370
			\$ -
Bell Atlantic	\$ 416,855	\$ 109,157	\$ (307,698)
Delaware	\$ 13,902	\$ 41	\$ (13,861)
Maryland	\$ 56,844	\$ 310	\$ (56,534)
New Jersey	\$ 49,875	\$ 256	\$ (49,619)
Pennsylvania	\$ 118,182	\$ 28,124	\$ (90,058)
Virginia	\$ 79,992	\$ 41,226	\$ (38,766)
Wash DC	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
West Virginia	\$ 98,060	\$ 39,200	\$ (58,860)
			\$ -
Bellsouth	\$ 887,186	\$ 431,057	\$ (456,129)
Alabama	\$ 96,555	\$ 86,829	\$ (9,726)
Florida	\$ 98,368	\$ 43,852	\$ (54,516)
Georgia	\$ 102,450	\$ 74,185	\$ (28,265)
Kentucky	\$ 84,892	\$ 34,527	\$ (50,185)
Louisiana	\$ 118,681	\$ 30,618	\$ (88,063)
Mississippi	\$ 127,522	\$ 68,563	\$ (58,959)
North Carolina	\$ 71,940	\$ 28,359	\$ (43,581)
South Carolin	\$ 68,723	\$ 23,550	\$ (43,173)
Tennessee	\$ 120,255	\$ 40,574	\$ (79,681)
			\$ -
NYNEX	\$ 460,034	\$ 96,150	\$ (363,884)
Maine	\$ 77,293	\$ 17,309	\$ (59,984)
Massachusetts	\$ 85,358	\$ 32	\$ (85,326)
New Hampshire	\$ 53,978	\$ 3,198	\$ (50,780)
New York	\$ 188,978	\$ 67,433	\$ (121,545)
Rhode Island	\$ 15,698	\$ -	\$ (15,698)
Vermont	\$ 38,729	\$ 7,988	\$ (30,741)
Connecticut		\$ 190	\$ 190
			\$ -
Pacific	\$ 193,118	\$ 249,906	\$ 56,788
California	\$ 172,568	\$ 204,207	\$ 31,639
Nevada	\$ 20,550	\$ 45,699	\$ 25,149
			\$ -
SBC	\$ 440,109	\$ 682,682	\$ 242,573
Arkansas	\$ 64,175	\$ 72,090	\$ 7,915
Kansas	\$ 46,665	\$ 83,710	\$ 37,045
Missouri	\$ 76,832	\$ 130,198	\$ 53,366
Oklahoma	\$ 70,690	\$ 120,934	\$ 50,244
Texas	\$ 181,747	\$ 275,750	\$ 94,003
			\$ -
US West	\$ 541,688	\$ 811,084	\$ 269,396
Arizona	\$ 74,830	\$ 86,660	\$ 11,830
Colorado	\$ 74,184	\$ 65,557	\$ (8,607)
Idaho	\$ 32,230	\$ 40,684	\$ 8,434
Iowa	\$ 35,018	\$ 69,714	\$ 34,696
Minnesota	\$ 58,366	\$ 94,885	\$ 36,519
Montana	\$ 21,713	\$ 59,789	\$ 38,076
Nebraska	\$ 23,282	\$ 80,380	\$ 57,078
New Mexico	\$ 47,681	\$ 75,561	\$ 27,880
North Dakota	\$ 13,754	\$ 45,322	\$ 31,568
Oregon	\$ 40,810	\$ 60,856	\$ 20,046
South Dakota	\$ 34,109	\$ 27,993	\$ (6,116)
Utah	\$ 28,828	\$ 37,573	\$ 8,745
Washington	\$ 40,469	\$ 46,673	\$ 6,204
Wyoming	\$ 16,434	\$ 19,477	\$ 3,043
Total	\$ 3,316,614	\$ 2,652,326	

Attachment D

**BENCHMARK MUST BE INCREASED
BY EXISTING SUBSIDY**

